

STATE OF WISCONSIN

BEFORE THE WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

JAMES F. RAMSEIER and the
JANESVILLE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Complainants,

vs.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF JOINT SCHOOL
DISTRICT NO. 1, CITY OF JANESVILLE
AND TOWNS OF JANESVILLE, HARMONY,
LA PRAIRIE AND ROCK, ROCK COUNTY,
WISCONSIN, and ROBERT COLLINS,
individually and as President of
Board of Education of Joint School
District No. 1, City of Janesville,
et al,

Respondents.

Case V

No. 12475. MP-57

Decision No. 8791-A

Appearances: Lawton and Cates, Attorneys at Law, by Mr. Richard L. Cates
and Mr. Robert C. Kelly, for the Complainants.
Melli, Smith, Shields & McGrory, Attorneys at Law, by
Mr. Joseph A. Melli, and Mr. T. P. Bidwell, City Attorney,
for the Respondents.

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Complaint of prohibited practices having been filed with the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission by James F. Ramseier and the Janesville Education Association; and the Commission, by Howard S. Bellman Hearing Officer, having conducted a hearing in the matter on January 3, 1969, at the Rock County Courthouse, Janesville, Wisconsin; and the Commission, having considered the evidence, arguments and briefs of counsel, and being fully advised in the premises, makes and files the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. That Complainant James F. Ramseier is an individual residing at Rural Route 4, Britt Road, Janesville, Wisconsin, and that Ramseier is president of the Complainant Janesville Education Association, hereinafter referred to as the JEA, a labor organization representing teachers for the purposes of collective bargaining.

No. 8791-A

2. That Respondent Board of Education of Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville and Towns of Janesville, Harmony, La Prairie and Rock, Rock County, Wisconsin, hereinafter referred to as the Board of Education, pursuant to the authority vested in it by said Joint School District, manages, controls and supervises the public schools within said city and towns, and in said regard employs certificated teachers in said schools; and that Respondent Robert Collins, a resident of Janesville, Wisconsin, is, and was at all times material herein, the president of the Board of Education.

3. That the JEA is, and was at all times material herein, the certified collective bargaining representative of all non-supervisory teaching personnel in the employ of the Board of Education; that in said capacity the JEA and the Board of Education were, at all times material herein, parties to a collective bargaining agreement covering the salaries and other conditions of employment of the non-supervisory teaching personnel in the employ of the Board of Education; and that said agreement contained, among its provisions, a provision relating to news releases issued by the parties during their negotiations.

4. That in the fall of 1968, while the JEA and the Board of Education, with Collins as Chairman of its bargaining committee, were engaged in negotiations on a collective bargaining agreement to succeed the presently existing agreement, and after the Board of Education had presented its budget to the Fiscal Board of the Joint School District, a representative of radio station WCLO, Janesville, Wisconsin, requested Collins to submit to an interview with respect to the 1969 school year budget, which interview would be taped and subsequently broadcast by said radio station; that, without any expressed authority from the Board of Education, Collins consented and participated in such interview, which was subsequently divided into segments, with such segments being aired by said radio station on November 13, 14 and 15, 1968; that during said interview Collins discussed certain aspects of the demands of the JEA during the negotiations, his opinions as to the effect of such demands on said budget, the alleged undue pressures placed on school boards by demands of teacher organizations generally, a proposal put forth by another member of the Board of Education with respect to increasing the pupil-teacher ratio as a means of reducing the budget, as well as other matters relating to the collective bargaining situation; that at no time during said interview did Collins make any promises of benefit or threats of reprisals, or did he imply same, to any teaching personnel in the employ of the Board of Education, or to their collective.

bargaining representative, the JEA, its members, agents or officers, because of the concerted activities of its teaching personnel, or because of the activity and demands of the JEA, its members, agents or officers, during the course of negotiations with representatives of the Board of Education in the fall of 1968; and that said interview was heard by the general public in the Janesville area, including teachers in the employ of the Board of Education.

5. That at no time material herein, either prior to or following the broadcast of the Collins interview, did the Board of Education, its officers or agents, disavow or repudiate the remarks made by Collins in said radio interview.

Upon the basis of the above and foregoing Findings of Fact the Commission makes the following

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. That Respondent Board of Education, as the duly authorized agent of Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville and Towns of Janesville, Harmony, La Prairie and Rock, Rock County, Wisconsin, a municipal employer within the meaning of Sec. 111.70(1)(a), Wisconsin Statutes, is properly named as a Respondent herein.

2. That Respondent Robert Collins, as president of said Respondent Board of Education, in participating in the radio interview which was broadcast throughout the Janesville, Wisconsin area on November 13, 14 and 15, 1968, by radio station WCLO, was acting for and on behalf of said Respondent Board of Education, and, as such, said Respondent Board of Education and its principal, Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville and Towns of Janesville, Harmony, La Prairie and Rock, are responsible for and are bound by the remarks contained in said radio interview for the purpose of determining whether, thereby, said Respondents committed any prohibited practices within the meaning of Sec. 111.70, Wisconsin Statutes.

3. That, since Sec. 111.70, Wisconsin Statutes, does not provide that violations of collective bargaining agreements covering employees in municipal employment are prohibited practices, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission has no jurisdiction to determine whether the aforementioned radio interview or the remarks therein violated any provisions of the collective bargaining agreement existing between Complainant Janesville Education Association and Respondent Board of Education.

4. That, with respect to the remarks made by Respondent Collins, in the aforementioned radio interview, Respondent Collins and Respondent Board of Education did not interfere with, restrain or coerce any employees in the employ of said Respondent Board of Education in the exercise of their rights as set forth in Sec. 111.70(2), Wisconsin Statutes, and, therefore, in said regard, said Respondents did not commit any prohibited practices within the meaning of any of the provisions of Sec. 111.70, Wisconsin Statutes.

Upon the basis of the above and foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Commission makes the following

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the complaint of prohibited practices filed in the instant matter be, and the same hereby is, dismissed.

Given under our hands and seal at the City of Madison, Wisconsin, this 31st day of March, 1969.

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

By

Morris Slayney
Morris Slayney, Chairman

Zel S. Rice II
Zel S. Rice II, Commissioner

William R. Wilberg
William R. Wilberg, Commissioner

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE THE WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

JAMES F. RAMSEIER and the
JANESVILLE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Complainants,

vs.

Case V
No. 12475 MP-57
Decision No. 8791-A

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF JOINT SCHOOL
DISTRICT NO. 1, CITY OF JANESVILLE
AND TOWNS OF JANESVILLE, HARMONY,
LA PRAIRIE AND ROCK, ROCK COUNTY,
WISCONSIN, and ROBERT COLLINS,
individually and as President of
Board of Education of Joint School
District No. 1, City of Janesville,
et al,

Respondents.

MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

The Pleadings

The Janesville Education Association and its President James F. Ramseier, hereinafter respectively referred to as the JEA and Ramseier, in their joint complaint alleged that the Board of Education of Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville, et al, and its President Robert Collins committed prohibited practices within the meaning of Section 111.70(3)(a)1, Wisconsin Statutes, by issuing a unilateral press release in violation of the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement existing between them and by participating in radio interviews while engaged in collective bargaining, wherein statements were made which interfered with, restrained and coerced teachers in the employ of the School Board, who were represented for the purposes of collective bargaining by JEA.

The named Respondents filed two separate answers which were practically identical and wherein they alleged the correct name of the Respondent Municipal Employer to be the Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville, et al, hereinafter referred to as Joint School District, rather than the Board of Education thereof, and that the

"APPENDIX A"

Notice To All Teachers

Pursuant to the Order of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission and in order to effectuate the policy of Section 111.70, Wisconsin Statutes, we hereby notify our teachers that:

WE WILL, for the coming school year, offer to Joseph Barrington the opportunity to return to Wells Junior High School to the position he occupied during the school year 1968-69 or to an equivalent teaching position.

WE WILL immediately furnish Joseph Barrington a new or amended evaluation for his teaching experience during the year 1968-69, based on a fair and non-discriminatory evaluation on his performance as a teacher.

WE WILL NOT discriminatorily evaluate and/or recommend reassignment of any teacher because of his or her concerted activity on behalf of Milwaukee Teachers Education Association, or by discriminating against our teachers in any manner pertaining to the tenure, terms or conditions of their employment.

WE WILL NOT in any other manner interfere with, restrain or coerce our teachers in the exercise of their right of self-organization and their right to affiliate with the Milwaukee Teachers Education Association and to be represented by it in conferences and negotiations with the School District, its officers and agents, on questions of salaries, hours and conditions of employment.

Milwaukee Board of School Directors

Superintendent of Schools

Principal, Wells Junior High School

Dated _____

THIS NOTICE MUST REMAIN POSTED FOR THIRTY (30) DAYS FROM THE DATE HEREOF AND MUST NOT BE ALTERED, DEFACED OR COVERED BY ANY OTHER MATERIAL.

collective bargaining agreement existed between the JEA and Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville, et al, rather than with the Board of Education thereof. The answers further alleged that Collins had never constituted either the Board of Education or the Joint School District as his agent for any purpose nor to contract on his behalf with respect to his freedom to participate in news interviews, and further that Collins did not so contract. Collins specifically denied making any statement or performing any act in connection with any radio interview which exceeded the limits of his constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. The Board of Education specifically denied that it executed a collective bargaining agreement with the JEA but that it did so as the agent of said Joint School District.

Collins and the Board of Education further specifically denied that the radio interviews involved herein were performed by Collins as an officer or agent of the Board of Education. Both the Board of Education and Collins admit that Collins, on November 13 through November 15, 1968, individually and unilaterally, and without consulting with the JEA, participated in a series of radio interviews which were subsequently broadcast throughout the Janesville listening area, but denied that in doing so Collins acted as President of the Board of Education. The Respondents further denied that the content of the statements made by Collins characterized the JEA "as acting improperly and irresponsibly, of exerting undue pressure on the Board, of misusing its collective power and in fact of such activity threatened to stop increases in salaries, to increase class sizes, to eliminate small classes, cut curriculum and eliminate one hundred twenty-five teacher jobs from the school system." The Respondents also denied that Collins' unilateral press release violated the collective bargaining agreement or that the Respondents committed any unlawful acts of interference, restraint or coercion in violation of Section 111.70, Wisconsin Statutes.

The Respondents further affirmatively alleged, among other things, that the JEA had not, with respect to the alleged violation of the collective bargaining agreement, utilized the grievance procedure set forth in said agreement with respect to disputes arising over the interpretation and application of said agreement, that the radio interview did not constitute a press release, that it was not made during negotiations, but during a period of mediation, and further that if the provision of the agreement in question, alleged to have been violated,

prohibited news interviews, that such a provision is contrary to public policy and contrary to anti-secrecy law and is, therefore, void and unenforceable.

The Alleged Violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement

During the course of the hearing the Complainants attempted to introduce evidence with respect to the alleged violation of the collective bargaining agreement by Respondents by the news release resulting from the Collins radio interview. Upon objection by the Respondents, the Hearing Officer conducting the hearing on behalf of the Commission sustained the objection on the basis that the violation of a collective bargaining agreement covering municipal employees is not a prohibited practice set forth in Section 111.70. The Hearing Officer permitted Complainants to make an offer of proof with regard thereto. Therein the Complainants contended that the nature of the alleged contractual violation constituted conduct evidencing anti-union animus or hostility, and, therefore, the Complainants should have been permitted to introduce evidence with regard thereto, in support of the allegation that Collins' radio interview constituted interference, restraint and coercion in violation of the statute. Upon review of the offer of proof and the entire record, we conclude that the Hearing Officer properly excluded evidence with respect to the alleged violation of the agreement. The matters contained in the offer of proof related to alleged violations of the provisions in the agreement regarding unilateral press releases and did not pertain to any activity by the Respondents which could be considered separate and apart therefrom as intending to establish any independent acts of interference, restraint, or coercion, or any unlawful motivation with respect thereto.

Background

Following the conduct of various meetings between the JEA and the Board of Education, during which no agreement was reached between the parties with respect to teachers' salaries for the coming school year, and after the Board of Education had presented its budget to the fiscal board of the School District, Board President Collins was contacted by the news staff of Radio Station WCLO, Janesville, and was asked to participate in an interview concerning the School Board budget, which interview was to be subsequently broadcast. Collins engaged in such taped interview which was approximately one hour in length. The tape was subsequently arranged in four 13-minute segments and was heard over the station on November 13, 14 and 15, 1968. President Collins did not seek the approval of the Board of Education to participate in the interview. The full contents of the interview, which consists of questions

propounded by the announcers who participated therein and answers to such questions by Collins, is attached hereto as "Appendix A." The Complainants contend that the underlined portion of the interview contain the coercive remarks which constitute unlawful interference with, and restraint and coercion of, employees in violation of the Statute.

Issues as to Parties

The Respondents contend that the Joint School District, rather than its Board of Education, should be named as the Respondent Municipal Employer, and, further, that Collins participated in the interview as an individual member of the Board of Education and not as its agent. The complaint identifies the Respondents as follows:

- "3. The Board of Education of Joint School District No. 1, City of Janesville, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "board") is a municipal employer and is charged with the management, control and supervision of the public schools within said school district and has its offices at 315 South Jackson Street, Janesville, Wisconsin.
- "4. That Robert Collins, an adult male residing at Janesville, Wisconsin, is President of the Board and an officer and agent thereof."

In our opinion, the complaint properly includes the Board of Education as a Respondent, and the fact that the Joint School District is not specifically separately named as a Respondent does not result in a faulty complaint or an improper identification of the Board of Education as a Respondent.

It is further contended that President Collins consented to the interview as an individual member of the Board of Education and that in participating therein he did not consider himself as its agent. In substantiation of this position Respondent Collins indicates that throughout the interview he used the personal pronoun "I" except when making a reference to the Board of Education. The Complainants contend that at all times material herein Collins was a member and President of the Board of Education, that he was also chairman of the committee which bargained and negotiated on behalf of the Board of Education, and that the Board of Education is, therefore, responsible for the statements made by Collins during the interview.

We are satisfied, under the circumstances herein, because of his office and participation in the negotiations with the JEA, despite the fact that he had no specific authority from the Board of Education to participate in the interview, Collins is, and was, an agent of the Board.

of Education, and that the Board of Education, as well as Collins, is responsible for any of the remarks made by him with respect to the negotiations between the JEA and the Board of Education.

The Taped Interview

The Complainants contended that the statements made by Collins during the course of the interview were coercive in that they contained a threat of reprisal and tended to discredit the JEA as the bargaining representative and were likely to undermine it in such status during the period when the parties were involved in conferences and negotiations on wages, hours and conditions of employment. The remarks of Collins as specifically set forth as being objectionable relate to his expressions that salary increases as requested by the JEA have to be stopped for to do otherwise would "tie down or burden the education system with unacceptable costs," and that in Collins' opinion the JEA was putting undue pressure on the School Board, and that, in general, the teacher representatives were asking for too much and were making a mistake by exerting their collective power to push and push. The Complainants contend that "the only reasonable inference that can be drawn from such remarks is that the labor organization, the certificated teachers have chosen to represent them in conferences and negotiations with their municipal employer on questions of wages, hours and conditions of employment is acting irresponsibly and improperly. The conclusion is left that the J.E.A., as well as other affiliates of the W.E.A., are not acting as organizations of professional educators interested in improving the quality of education, but in fact in the exercise of their collective power are exercising undue pressure and are pushing, pushing in the welfare and salary areas and such pressure must be resisted or such demands will burden education with unacceptable costs to its detriment."

The Complainants consider the remaining pertinent remarks as being directed primarily toward methods being considered by the School Board to resist such "undue pressure" from the JEA, such as changing the pupil-teacher ratio, eliminating small classes, assigning more students to teachers by the use of closed circuit television or computers or other technological aids, and to Collins' desires in this regard and to his expressed frustration with the School Board's failure to accomplish same.

Also alleged to be objectionable are the remarks of Collins with respect to possible non-reluctance of the Board of Education to reduce the number of teachers should the need arise if the latter should increase the pupil-teacher ratio. In summation the Complainants state as follows:

"These statements were coercive. President Collins informed the bargaining unit teachers that their employer considered the economic requests being made by the J.E.A., the representative they had chosen, in the exercise of their rights pursuant to 111.70(2), to represent them in conferences and negotiations with such employer to be unreasonable, unacceptable and excessive. Further, that if they continued to support the J.E.A., their chosen bargaining representative, and these economic requests, it could or would result in the loss of 125 teacher jobs.

We respectfully submit this is an express threat of economic reprisal if unit employees continue to support their chosen bargaining representative and its economic demands.

We further respectfully submit that the involved employees, at the very least, could reasonably interpret these remarks to imply such a threat of economic reprisal. The statements made were coercive and therefore interfered with the employees rights to be represented by a labor organization of their own choice in conferences and negotiations and are therefore a violation of Section 111.70(3)(a)(1) Wis. Stats. The threat of economic reprisal as well as the statements discrediting the J.E.A. tended to, or were likely to, undermine the J.E.A., making totally ineffective the act of employees in choosing such bargaining representative."

The Respondents generally contend that the radio interview did not contain material which can reasonably be said to interfere with the rights of the employees and the employee organization involved and that the interview was merely a discussion of the aspects of the school board budget, and even if the subject of the interview were centered on negotiations, rather than the budget, the statements therein were mere predictions of the economic impact of the JEA action and therefore are permissible. The Respondents further argue that Collins had a duty as well as a right to discuss such public issues since the discussion of the matter was of public importance and that whatever the contents of the interview, it was privileged. The Respondents argue that Section 111.70(3)(a)1 should not be applied in the situation since the interest of the community and public discussion of a matter affecting the public interest is of greater importance. The Respondents generally conclude that if the Complainants can show that public discussion of public issues can constitute interference, it has first to prove an intent to interfere, restrain and coerce employees in violation of Section 111.70(3)(a)1. The latter statute, if so applied, is inconsistent with the constitutionally guaranteed right of free speech.

Specifically, with respect to the statements claimed to be violative of the Act, the Respondents contended that such statements are not what they are alleged to be. They argue that the interview was "a remarkably

fair and high-minded assessment of the state of the Janesville educational system from both economic and quality points of view." They contend that the statement with regard to pressure of the teacher association was a reference to teacher associations in general and not the JEA. With respect to his remarks concerning the collective power of teacher representatives to "push and push," the Respondents claim that such statements merely constitute a prediction that school boards will have to respond to pressure rather than more restraint and that such statements are, in effect, a repetition of the truism that the parties in collective bargaining have interests which are often at odds. With respect to the statement that increasing class sizes was, in theory, a method to cut costs, the Respondents contend that Collins acknowledged that "at present there was no way yet for it to get done." In any event, they contend, there is no indication in the interview that any increase in class size would be effected for the purpose of undermining the teacher organization and that the theory of increasing pupil-teacher ratio is a "viable long-term economic response to the fast rising costs."

The Respondents further contend that Collins did not threaten to eliminate 125 teacher jobs from the school system. He indicated, that it could not be done under the present circumstances since a satisfactory educational program could not be carried out under present conditions with that many less teachers.

Furthermore, the Respondents argue that there is greater latitude given to employers to express views, arguments and opinions on the subject of concerted activity and where, as claimed herein, the statements complained of consist of spoken words and not of any actual physical action such as interrogation or surveillance of employees, the free speech issue is prominent. The Respondents argue that the comments made by Collins were not addressed to the teachers and that there was no evidence that Collins intended or could reasonably have reached or affected the teachers in that his remarks were intended for the general public. The Respondents also argue that Collins' interview should be protected under Section 14.90(1), Wisconsin Statutes, which provides:

"In recognition of the fact that a representative government of the American type is dependent upon an informed electorate, it is declared to be the policy of the State that the public is entitled to the fullest and most complete information regarding the affairs of government as is compatible with the conduct of government affairs and the transaction of government business."

With regard thereto the Respondents contend as follows:

"Collins was merely discussing with the public, through a public broadcast medium, the issues which Collins was elected by the public to deal with. Not only would it be intolerable to restrict the right of a public employee, especially an elected employee, to discuss public issues with the public, but public employees have an affirmative duty to so discuss the issues. In our view, Collins would have been derelict in his duty had he refused the interview with the radio station, or had he refused to fully and fairly answer questions put by the interviewer. This is especially true in view of the timing of the interview request, occurring as it did just after a School Board budget meeting which was itself public. In fact, the suggestion of one Board member that class size be increased had been discussed at that public Board meeting. These statements at the Board meeting are not alleged to have constituted interference. The interviewer apparently believed that the Board viewed the proposal to immediately increase class sizes with favor. Collins dispelled that belief. Had Collins not discussed the proposal in this interview, the public and the complainants could have reasonably entertained the belief that the School Board would increase class sizes during the current year. No such belief could be entertained after the interview."

Prior to determining whether Collins' interview contained remarks which were violative of Sec. 111.70(3)(a)1, we must first consider the defenses raised by the Respondents to the effect that, regardless of the contents of the interview, the remarks therein were privileged since the interview concerned itself with matters "of public importance," and further, that the remarks made during the course of the interview by Collins were not addressed to the teachers, nor was there any evidence that they were intended or could reasonably have reached the teachers.

All phases of the collective bargaining relationship in municipal employment concern matters of public importance since the rights and duties established in the statute are of public interest and since the public, as taxpayers, is, in effect, a stockholder in the municipal corporation. The legislature, in enacting Sec. 111.70, restricted certain privileges formerly exercised by agents of municipal employers in their relationships with municipal employees, whether such privileges were in the form of action or statements. Statements made by public officials lose their privilege if they are violative of the provisions of the municipal employer-employee labor relations statute.

We cannot accept the Respondent's argument that the radio interview was not directed to, or that it was not intended to reach the teachers. The use of such a news media, especially after considerable publicity had been given to the interview prior to its broadcast, and the record indicates that Ramseyer heard the interview, warrants a conclusion that, at least one member of the JEA did hear the interview.

As to whether Collins' remarks constituted unlawful interference, restraint and coercion of the teachers in the exercise of the rights established in Sec. 111.70, we agree with the Respondents that the remarks in the interview, in the context and at the time when they were made, were not violative of the statute. Collins had the right to discuss the demands of the JEA upon the Board of Education and the probable effect thereof, not only on the finances of the School Board but on the education process as a whole in the school district. The fact that the prophesied results might be detrimental to the members of the JEA does not convert such prophecies into unlawful threats. Further, Collins' alleged criticism of the JEA, even assuming that said remarks inferred that the JEA was acting irresponsibly and improperly as the representative of the teachers in the employ of the school district, was not in violation of the statute. While we do not encourage such remarks, if we were to eliminate remarks critical of employee and of employer representatives from the bargaining process as prohibited practices, the process might collapse, perhaps from shock alone.

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin, this 31st day of March, 1969.

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION.

By

Morris Slavney
Morris Slavney, Chairman

Earl S. Rice II
Earl S. Rice II, Commissioner

William R. Wilberg
William R. Wilberg, Commissioner

APPENDIX "A"

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW BETWEEN QUESTIONERS
LARRY TAINTER AND JERRY VAN HORN,
OF RADIO STATION WCLO,
AND ROBERT COLLINS

Q Now, Mr. Collins, first of all, in recent months there have been innuendos cast by members of the City Council, not necessarily by the Board of Education, but the innuendos have filled the air that there may be a kind of a subtle rift developing between the Council and the School Board. Probably the first signal of any irritation -- I am sure that is a bad choice of words -- but the first signal of this probably was the budget cut ordered last year, the \$100,000 budget cut ordered by the Council. What do you see as the Board's feelings towards the Council, general attitude? Do you feel that there is any resentment toward the Council, and let's include not only the budget cut but things that have developed since then: the Council's approach to the unified school district and the Board's approach to the Council's wishes on a school safety patrol? These would be included in this heading as well.

A Let me try and answer that, Jerry, this way. I think you have got to remember that there probably isn't any attitude by the Board as such, because these are nine individual members; and what my attitude might be might be diametrically opposed to what somebody else's might be. I am thinking now particularly, to take them in reverse order, with respect to the school safety patrol. I think Commissioner Titus reflected some resentment on the part of the City Council. He must have interpreted the resolution of the City Council as a direction to the School Board to establish a safety patrol. Actually it wasn't that at all. It was, as you probably remembered, requesting that we give serious consideration to the establishment of a patrol. I think this was very much in order that they do this. This would be in order for any group of the city, I would think, who sees a problem that needs to be solved, and thinks the School Board should play a role in solving it. Consequently I had no resentment whatever to the City Council for this. Now with respect to the budget cut of last year, I don't think the Board as a whole actually felt resentment toward the City Council. I think the Board felt that they had analyzed the budget and felt that as presented it was what the school system needed. We recognize the authority to levy taxes is in the City Council's hands, and once the decision is made, that is it; and we must live with it. And I disagree with -- if there have been innuendos on the part of the administration or the staff, to blame anything that came up during the year on the City Council for this \$100,000 budget cut. I think this is the wrong approach. I think we have to make our case as best we can in presenting to the City Council what we think the system needs; and if they choose to give us less money than that, then naturally they have to bear the responsibility for whatever we cannot do directly because of this budget cut. But I don't think it is appropriate for us to go around like children and constantly criticizing them for making this cut. They have a tough problem on their hands in that they do have the authority to levy taxes, and any tax increase that is objected to by the citizens comes back at them. When they have to levy a \$12 or \$13 or \$15 increase, this is hard to swallow. And I appreciate their problem; and, at the same time, as far as we are concerned, we think that the taxes must be levied. If we had the authority to levy them, we would levy them. We don't -- if they want to throw the responsibility back to us, that is fine. We don't object to this at all. I think Commissioner Schneider misinterpreted our stand with respect to the unified district in that regard in that he said he didn't understand why the School Board wasn't pushing to go to a unified district unless they weren't willing to accept the responsibility to levy the taxes. This wasn't our position. We felt -- and again perhaps there are some Board members who voted against seeking a change to the unified district for one reason and some for the other -- my own feeling was that I voted against it because I thought we

would have too much of a problem getting the buildings we needed, not because I was concerned that the School Board would go hog wild and levy high taxes if we had the authority to do so. Other Board members may have felt that the idea of having one local body to levy the taxes was better. So this really raises the point again that it is difficult to consider the Board as a whole in deciding how they react to something. Even though they have to decide on issues as a Board, the individual members have different reactions.

Q Well, then with your permission if I can sum up what I think you said just briefly -- you correct me if I am wrong. While some individual members of the Board may react in different ways to actions, on the other side, the City Council, the Board as a whole does not harbor any resentment nor does it conduct its monthly business with the prime thought in mind that the City Council may agree or disagree?

A No, this is right, and I am sure in my own case -- and I feel sure I can speak for the Board -- that in any decision that we have to make we try to approach it objectively, irrespective of whether the City Council has taken a position for or against what we are talking about. We are trying to determine the facts. We think that our relationship with the City Council is good. You can always see areas where it could be improved, but I don't see this is a problem at all.

Q I had a couple of other questions, Larry, before we get into the budget.

A All right.

Q The question had been raised earlier this month or late last month, and it was raised again at this week's Council meeting. Justification for continued employment or hiring of Childs and Smith of Chicago as the architectural firm for any new school building programs the department might undertake? What is the school department's feeling on using Childs and Smith without considering other firms, possibly local but not necessarily, and the possibility that some savings in construction costs might result because of a different choice of architects?

A I think the reason we have stayed with Childs and Smith has been the quality of the supervision that they have provided. As you heard last night at the Council meeting, the number of change orders that we had to approve in the buildings that I am familiar with, which would be Parker Senior High and Van Buren and Monroe, I believe it was, with Childs and Smith as the architectural firm was something less than one-quarter of one percent, I believe Bill Young said. This is important from a cost standpoint because change orders are expensive, and they run up the cost of a building. This, I believe, can be accounted for by the quality of the specifications that are written for the bidders so that they can bid on the job; and you don't have to make changes because of something coming up later on, and the quality of the supervision. They have a large staff; they have excellent people. Fred Rasmussen, who is now on our staff, I believe was formerly with Childs and Smith; and we think Fred is a very qualified man and is helping a lot. Childs and Smith is a noted architectural firm in Chicago with respect to educational institutions, and they are probably attuned to the latest developments in educational buildings as well as any architectural firm in the Midwest. We talked at some length before we decided to go with Childs and Smith on this current building program about having the other architectural firms present something in the way of -- well, their credentials and maybe some plans. We decided not to because on balance it was felt that this was most likely not to result in a decision to change. Now, our judgment, I think, on this can be legitimately questioned that maybe we should have gone ahead anyway, but time was of the essence here. Our experience with Childs and Smith was excellent. We just didn't feel now was the time for a change. I did say at

last night's Council meeting -- and I think I spoke for the Board when I said this -- that we certainly would like to retain local or Wisconsin firms if we felt that they provided the same services, and we would seriously consider specifically the local firm of Frellich & Angus the next time we had a building program.

Q Will you be doing this with regard to the new elementary school, the new junior high that is about to rise from the ground next year?

A No, we are committed to Childs and Smith for that, yes.

Q May I ask, Bob. I also believe there was some indication on the part of the Council that they were talking about possibly using the same set of plans over for the new building. First, let me ask what your thoughts were on that; and, secondly, let me ask if this was done, what would be the savings to the taxpayer?

A The background on that, Larry, is that the normal architect's fee is 6 per cent of the construction cost. We have an arrangement with Childs and Smith that if we reuse the same plans, we will pay them only a 2 per cent fee. I don't know whether this is the usual arrangement or not. I think we felt that this was some foresight on the part of previous Boards; and I think specifically it was Bill Ryan's efforts to make this arrangement definite so that we didn't have to pay the 6% fee if we were just using the same plans. So, the savings of the taxpayer, if we use the same plans, would be 4 per cent of the construction cost. Now, that does not include the cost of the land, site work, and equipment, and that sort of thing. Construction cost on the Van Buren school, I would guess, was something like \$750,000; so 4 per cent of that would be \$30,000. So if we use the same plans, we would save the taxpayers \$30,000. Now the last -- when we built Van Buren, when we committed ourselves to Van Buren, we had the option of continuing to use the Monroe plans with the same 4 per cent savings, but it was decided and determined -- and this was born out by the bids -- that the cost of constructing Van Buren, even paying the 6 per cent fee, was substantially less than using the Monroe plan and using the 2 per cent fee, so that is why we went ahead. That same philosophy holds true with respect to this current elementary building that we will be putting up. Now the Council last night suggested that since the Van Buren school was just designed a year ago that there would most likely be very little -- this was supposed to be the latest in the educational elementary institution for elementary schools -- why didn't we go to the plan definitely. Well, my answer last night -- and I think it is valid -- is that we probably will, but we wanted to give the architectural firm the opportunity to convince us that we could save money by going to a different plan. But I would think the -- and they are aware of, as I say, of so many things that are going on in the educational building field, and it is not impossible that during this past year there might have been some changes in building materials and in approaches that could save us money, so we just didn't want to give up on this.

Q Does a school building change that much from year to year?

A Recently I would have to say yes, especially in this idea of having what we call the open pods, and getting rid of the walls, you know. Van Buren has some of that in it, and the question now is maybe we should extend that and have more open pods, in which case we might be able to save more money; but there is somewhat of a reluctance by the educators to move too fast to these open pods because they haven't had enough experience yet with that sort of thing. Instead of walls you have these visual barriers, which are bookcases and that sort of thing, you know.

Q Does this modular type -- is this the proper term?

A I think so.

Q Modular type lend itself easily to construction of additions on original plans?

A One of the modular type buildings that Childs and Smith showed us that they built down in Illinois did not, and this was a disadvantage in their mind of going to that; and I think this was one where you had almost all of the modular type. Now if you have just one wing, this sort of thing, then you can add on to the other wings without too much difficulty..

Q Well, would this new elementary school that you are proposing now to have the architects work on, would this also be of the pod or modular type?

A Possibly yes. If we went to the Van Buren, it would be too some extent; and I think the current feeling is that we should at least have that much flexibility in this next building, and that is why if I were a betting man, I would bet that we would go to the Van Buren plan.

Q I would like to get into a discussion of the school budget with you a little bit, Bob, and first of all I would like to start out in general terms. I have noticed many times during the School Board budget meetings that when the School Board is talking about its budget they say that we must have this money because we must maintain a "high quality educational system." I think in one meeting I counted the term used nine times! I was wondering if you might be able to define for us a "high quality educational system."

A I would sure like to, Larry, but I am afraid I can't. I think there have been some efforts made in this direction obviously. There is an association called North Central Association of Secondary Schools, or something like that, that have criteria for various departments; and they make an evaluation periodically; and they are going to make one in Janesville in '71 and '72. There is a small book setting forth these criteria, and I suppose that if you meet them all, this would be a basis for saying you have a quality school system. We have had studies made recently on how our graduates do in college. Somebody might argue that the fact that they do better than average indicates that we have a better than average school system. I suppose there are a lot of holes that you could poke in that kind of criteria because it depends on the ability of the children as they enter the system, and so you might say the efficiency of your system should be measured by how much you gain, how much the children gain in achievement from when they enter and when they leave. These are very difficult measurements, and we sure wish that we had some easy, simple answers; but we don't. The State Department of Public Instruction and the University of Wisconsin, I think, generally feel that Janesville has a very good school system because they do experiment with us when they have a choice of schools all over the state, so.

Q Well, just to review a little bit, I believe that after your \$200,000 cut of last week, we are now talking about a total school budget of, I believe it is \$9,947,000 and some odd dollars; and I believe this relates to a tax rate increase of about \$7; and means \$54.34 of the Janesville taxpayers' taxes are going to go for school purposes. So I would like to speak to you a little bit about a few of the items in the budget where it appears there are -- if I might take the liberty of calling them -- substantial increases. I believe the increase in the budget this year ranges, total budget, ranges 25 per cent to 27 per cent.

A I think this is right.

A-1-

Q Okay. Now if I can go back to, I believe on our program in Perspective last Thursday, we talked a bit about a few items in the instruction section of the budget. One of them that we talked about was the Business Education budget for instruction, which last year was \$5,476 and this year is \$10,400. I wonder if you might give us a brief account of the reason for the approximately 50 per cent increase?

A Or 100 per cent increase.

Q 100 per cent, pardon me.

A Yes, Larry, this is primarily due to the administration's request to equip another classroom at Craig to teach typing. The beginning -- and this means buying, I suppose, 35 new manual typewriters; and Bill Young indicated that the general approach on replacement of typewriters is that they are replaced every four to five years, at least the manual ones are. And I have done a little checking around myself, and a lot of industries change more like 9 or 10 years. But, if you dig into this, you find out their use is no where near as heavy as the typewriters in a classroom. The typewriters in general office use in the school system are not changed but every 9 to 10 years. There are a lot of them that are still in use that are 15 years old. This all depends on the kind of care that the individual girl gives the typewriter. Bill Young has said that the 4 to 5 year replacement is a sort of a standard in the state in school systems because they get such very heavy use. The Vocational School try to replace them about every five years. I talked to the Director over there, and he said that they don't feel theirs get quite as heavy a use as the public schools because the people that are using them are a little older and they don't pound them quite as hard.

Q Do repair costs after that period become oppressive, or do the machines just completely wear out?

A The repair costs become oppressive. It's kind of like a car that after a certain number of years the cost of repairing it is more than the cost of maintaining it. We have, I think, a maintenance contract with most of the typewriter dealers of \$15 a year, and this covers the labor cost and any minor parts. Any major parts we have to pay for ourselves; but they won't give us that after four years because then it is just too much of a problem.

Q When we equip a classroom with typewriters, is this done from one company?

A At the present time they try to have two or three different ones. We discussed with the administration in the interest of cost saving, and they said it would be a cost saving that we equip them with one single make. We may do this. As a matter of fact, this particular item in the budget may be one that will be reduced.

Q Now, if we can go on. I believe we also talked on that program about the music department budget for instruction which was \$11,057 last year and is \$28,000 this year. Perhaps you could again here give us a brief account of why?

A One item in here is 30 additional band uniforms for Parker. They have, I think, 70 now. This would give them a hundred, so the children who are taking band could be in the marching unit. Craig has about 110 uniforms. We cut back buying 100 last year for Parker in the interest of saving money, and so this 30 is in this year. These, incidentally, cost about \$75 a piece. And then also here are some large band instruments like sousaphones. Again, this is an effort to build up Parker's band, I suppose, to where Craig's is. I might mention that this is an area where I think there will be some cuts. The \$200,000 cut will be applied to this area, I am pretty sure.

Q The number of band uniforms, if I am correct, does not affect the size of the band class? Am I correct there? The child can still take music?

A Yes, I am sure that is right. It is just a matter of the marching unit.

Q Okay. Now on to the audio-visual section. Last year this was \$16,000; this year is \$30,000. Quite a substantial increase?

A Yes.

Q May I ask why there?

A Yes, there are 50 TV set receivers, 41 overhead projectors, 15 sound projectors, 120 carts, and 36 film strip projectors. Now about a year ago -- maybe more than that -- when Lowell Wilson took over the audio-visual coordinator's job, he presented to the Board a summary of how we stood with respect to our audio-visual equipment as compared to what the audio-visual association thought should be the standard. I always think you've got to take this with a grain of salt because -- these standards -- because they are set up by people who are more inclined to establish importance to their own particular field, I think, than maybe a more objective appraisal would do; but nevertheless these -- I think we have to pay some attention to them, and we are very low on them, and I think this is an attempt to build that up a little bit. Again, I think there will be a cut here.

Q As I recall, approximately a year ago at the time the Council and School Board were meeting, I believe it was on the budget, and they were talking about going to cable television. I believe it was mentioned at that time that if cable television was used, it would be likely that they would be able to cut down on the number of projectors and this type of thing.

A I think that this may be true, Larry. My recollection is that it was more that they could cut down on the number of films because they wouldn't need so many to transport around to the various schools. It was in the materials, I think, more than in the equipment.

Q Of course, if you were using cable TV where you can show one film on one projector to, say, all the second grade classes, you naturally need less equipment?

A Yes, that's true. That's true.

Q But you feel that there probably will be a --

A Yes, I think there will be a cut in this area.

Q In the Foreign Language instruction budget, we have an increase from \$3,406 last year to \$18,400 this year?

A Yes. At the present time we have a foreign language lab -- one lab at Craig, one at Marshall, two at Franklin, and none at Parker. This proposal for \$18,400 would add one more at Franklin to complete the three rooms there, and add two at Parker. I am ~~sure~~ that there will be a cut here. I think we feel that we should put one at Parker anyway because they don't have any, but I don't think we feel we should put two in at this time, nor do I think we feel we should add one more at Franklin. So, in other words, then there will be a foreign language at each of the secondary schools. There will be two at Franklin. Now you might ask, well, why isn't Marshall asking for another one if these foreign language labs are so good? Well, the problem with Marshall is

that they don't have any place to put it. And the ones at Franklin are what they call overhead. You pull them down out of the ceiling, and you can use the room for a regular class, too. I think that they feel that if they have one more lab out there that they will make use of it, but I think it's just a matter that we won't be able to do that now. I think that is going to have to be substantially cut back.

Q I think we are going to have to pause for a moment here. I notice the tape is running short.

(End of Tape No. 1)

Q If I can pursue this language laboratory appropriation proposal a little further, does the administration sincerely feel that the difference in the quality and results of instruction in the area of foreign languages far exceeds -- far exceeds with these language laboratories -- the quality that would otherwise result without the use of the labs?

A I think that the opinion of the administration would be that it depends on the feeling of the foreign language teacher toward the lab and whether they have it available for them when they feel it is important to use it with the student. Our investigation of this with the administration in the past is that some teachers make excellent use of them; some feel that they aren't that good. The one at Marshall -- we have a problem there in scheduling -- so that I would have to say -- and you could get more accurate and more valid information from the Chairman of the Foreign Language Department probably -- but I would have to say that they aren't a panacea certainly, no.

Q I believe there is also quite a substantial increase in the general instruction budget for some new elementary science kits?

A Yes, and I happen to have been at the administration when the presentation was made by the salesman from Xerox who markets these kits. They are called AAAS kits. The American Association for the Advancement of Science developed this approach to teaching science in the elementary schools, and it's been on test at schools around the country. I think there have been three or four in Wisconsin, and particularly in Oshkosh they have had it. And a couple of our principals went up there to visit to see what they are doing; and just as a matter of an example of what the children that have been taking this course have been able to do, in first grade two children measured the force created when a ball rolled down an inclined plane and hit another ball at the end. This was in first grade!

Q I couldn't do that in twelfth grade.

A It was very impressive that this kind of materials could do this; and it seemed that it was a much more logical method of teaching science and scientific concepts; and all of the administrators are very anxious to go into this. I questioned, frankly, the necessity of applying it on a system-wide basis, that maybe we could just do it in a few schools; but the Director of Elementary Education said that would be difficult for kids transferring from one school to the other if this were the case. They feel that the testing period has been extensive enough so that there is no question but what that it is worthwhile. I might point out -- this is something I just happened to work out myself the other day -- is that the increase in instructional supplies in the budget goes from \$137,000 to \$180,000; but in textbooks we decreased by \$19,000; and the decrease in textbooks is explained partly by the fact that textbooks are being replaced by things that are more in the nature of workbooks and go into the supplies and materials section. So that if we compare the

total of the textbooks last year and the supplies and materials -- that is about \$253,000 -- to the total of the administration's proposal of '69 of those same two items, we find that it is a 9 per cent increase. Whereas, if you just look at the supplies and materials instructional, it's like a 35 per cent increase. Getting back to your question in general supplies, this is because there are more things that are being bought to replace textbooks that go into the general supplies area.

Q Are there any of these that -- again, I am searching for a good choice of words, but I would call them gimmicks -- are some of these gimmicks just that or are they proven? Such as the science kits, are they proven to be the coming thing in educational material such as modern math has developed to be?

A I think that the feeling on these science kits is that it has been tested long enough and the authorship of it is valid enough so that it is solid. If you saw what it was, I think you would be convinced. At least I was because it is a matter of having pyramids and cylinders and spheres and this sort of thing in kit form. These are basic shapes that are used along with a method of presenting it. It doesn't strike us as gimmicky, although I am sure that there are some of these things that are developed that don't bear out.

Q As it has in this case of the science kits, does the administration and the Board of Education consistently attempt to evaluate any new materials that do approach the market before accepting them for use in the classroom?

A Very definitely. The educational system, I think, has been often criticized for not moving fast enough to innovate. I suspect that this is true certainly. I have said it myself, and I think it is. But they've seen -- I think the professionals who have been in the field have seen innovations that get a lot of popular support, and then all of a sudden, two years or so later, they find out it is not a good idea at all. So, they are inclined not to grab on to something new. And I think our people are inclined to be a little conservative. For example, they waited three years on this science thing before even considering it. They wanted it to be tested out, so I think that they do definitely study it.

Q Now, Bob, we are dealing with a 9.9 million dollar budget. What per cent of this is salaries?

A I think total professional and non-professional would be something in the area of 75 to 80 per cent.

Q 75 to 80 per cent?

A I would think so.

Q Seeing this is such a large portion of our budget then, can I ask you: we have seen increases and more increases in this area. How far can we go? How much can we afford before we have to stop giving increases?

A This is a very proper question, I think, Larry. I don't know. My own feeling is that we have to stop giving these kinds of increases rather promptly, or we are just going to tie down or burden the educational system with unacceptable costs. At the same time we have to be mindful of the kind of salaries schedule we have to have in order to get the teachers. We don't like to just play follow the leader, so to speak, or leap frog if you want to call it that, with other districts in the state and say: well, everybody else is increasing, so we have to, too. We don't like to be controlled by this. We like to have the ability to decide what we should have in the way of a salary schedule and stick with it.

but the practicalities of the matter just say this is not possible. It is like anybody paying a construction worker, the carpenter, for example. You have to pay the prevailing wage, or you just won't get any carpenters. So we have to bear in mind anyway -- not be governed completely, but bear in mind -- what other districts are doing; and even with the tremendous increase we made last year, which averaged 19 per cent increase, we find this year our salary schedule is just average. This is what we expected, and this is what we felt we could do, and we weren't going to try and do any more than that. But if the other districts continue to go up -- and I can't understand how they can continue to do it -- we will continue to have the pressure to go up. Now --

Q Excuse me for interrupting. Are these statewide averages that you are talking about, or does the board make selective comparisons?

A The comparison that I use most generally is the comparison of schools having more than 10,000 students or more than 300 teachers. There are about 20 to 25. These are cities compared to our size, and this is the one that I say we are just sort of an average. Now the smaller -- it has been suggested that we should compare ourselves with the schools in the immediate area in southern Wisconsin. We can do this, and we know how we compare; but we feel that in order to attract the high quality people we want, we are more likely to be competing with cities like Green Bay or Appleton or Wausau or La Crosse, that sort of thing, rather than Clinton or Albany because I think the graduate who comes out of college is more inclined to have his mind made up to go to a smaller school or a larger school; and I think the salary difference has to be very, very substantial to affect his decision in that regard. As a matter of fact, the beginning salary for the small area schools in this area is about the same as our \$6,100 -- \$6,000 or \$6,100. What they don't do is that they don't go as high as we do. Whereas our present top for a master's degree plus 24 credits and 13 years experience is \$11,740, I would say the average top for schools in the area would be like \$9,500 or \$10,000.

Q Is that because their experience is they don't retain teachers as long?

A Yes, I think that's true.

Q Well, I know it is hard to eliminate this average salary factor, that is comparative salary factor, but quite frankly speaking, do you feel that the Board is feeling undue pressure from the teachers' representative?

A I think the teachers' associations are putting undue pressure on boards of education. I am convinced of this. They are just asking for too much. I think compared to what other college graduates are getting, I think that they have been low, but I think that we are closing this gap; and I think the teachers make a mistake by exerting their collective power to just push and push. I think that boards of education are going to resist these demands more and more in the future, simply because we have to. There is just no two ways about it as far as we are concerned.

Q After that 19 per cent increase of last year, the salary schedule that was set up, isn't it true that this salary schedule would have automatically provided a year by year increase for the teachers?

A This is right, in the nature of 4-1/2 per cent per year, that's right; and what we are negotiating now is how much additional increase will be granted on top of the regular yearly increment. I have wondered what it was like twenty years ago, and one of the institutes I went to in Madison about a

month ago had a presentation by one of the principals in the Madison district, who is a negotiator for the Board and has been for about 25 years and before that he was a negotiator for the teachers group before he became a principal, and he said -- I think these years are right -- between 1923 and 1940, their salary schedule didn't change. They got an increase each year, but there wasn't any change in the salary schedule. And this, of course, is what it was designed for originally is that it was a schedule so that a person being hired could look at it and say, "Okay. Five years from now, if I stay here, I will be making this much." But the fact that we change it each year makes it really a misnomer to call it a schedule because nobody stays on it for more than a year.

Q We actually would not need a salary schedule as such?

A No. The only purpose it serves now is in hiring new people, you can show them where they start. But as far as that schedule telling a teacher that his raise next year will be as shown on the schedule, no, this is just not the case with inflation and everything else.

Q I am assuming, I don't know for a fact, but I am assuming there is a state association of boards of education?

A This is right.

Q Has this association issued any policy statement, any strong policy statement, to get local boards to hold the line on salary increases? What's it doing in this area?

A Primarily it serves as a clearing house, so that boards know what other districts are doing.

Q Not necessarily policy forming?

A No, it hasn't developed at that point yet. I think my own feeling is that perhaps it should take a stronger stand. They try to acquaint boards with the kind of information that boards should have when they discuss these things with teachers' associations, because the real purpose of the negotiation session is to exchange ideas as to why they or we think the salary schedule should change or should not change. And what the school boards association tries to do is to let the boards know that this is the kind of information that is relevant to this issue, and you ought to have it available so you can discuss it intelligently. So this is their primary function at this time.

Q Seeking your own opinion, not necessarily the position of the Board, do you think that this state association should be a much stronger force. Of course, the WEA representing the other side is a very strong force, and it would seem to me that perhaps the Boards of education in the state might want a counter-strength statewide so to speak.

A My own personal opinion is that it should be. I have been making some effort on my own to get the association -- not organized on a different basis, but set up so that districts of the same size have a closer working relationship because those districts have more the same common problems, not only in negotiations, but in just the administration generally. We don't have too much in common with a -- the problems that we run into, I should say, are not often very much like the problems that Milton runs into, for example. And this is obviously not in any way the fact that our problems are worse or anything else. They are just different, you know. You gain more by exchanging ideas with somebody who has the same common problems. I think that if we can get it reorganized this way, I think it will be more useful.

Q If I can get a little more specific, Bob, I believe that at the last Board of Education meeting Commissioner William Ryan made a proposal whereby he claimed that the Board of Education could save \$500,000 or half a million dollars by placing two more children in each classroom. In other words, each teacher takes two more children, and could save a million dollars by putting four to five more children in a classroom. I believe you voted against that proposal?

A Yes, I think Bill arrived at those figures by taking two more -- the average pupil-teacher ratio, I think, in secondary is in the nature of 23 or 24 or 25, whereas in elementary it is more like 28 or 29. Bill felt that if you could change that by 2, that would be about a 10 per cent increase in the ratio and so that therefore you could make a 10 per cent reduction in the instructional part of your budget, which was about five million. This as a percentage you can't argue with it, but Bill was talking about taking that \$500,000 out of the calendar 1969 budget. Now, we can't reduce the number of teachers that we have on -- committed now -- for the 1968-69 school year, so it would all have to come out of the number of teachers we would have during the 69-70 year; and the only portion of their salary that is in the '69 budget is for the fall part of it.

Q About 40 per cent?

A That's right. So, if you take \$500,000 -- we used, I think \$9,000 or \$8,500 as the average salary of a teacher. If you take 4 per cent of that, that's \$3,500 about; and divide that into \$500,000 you find out to save that \$500,000 in one year you would have to reduce your teacher staff by about 120 or 125, or 40 teachers. And when you say to yourself how does this add up? But it does, just by changing the pupil-teacher ratio that much you release that many teachers apparently because it just seems to work out that way. And that is why I don't think we can apply it the way Bill did. I think, however, in order to make any real impact, I fully agree with Bill on this, and that is to make any real impact on the budget you have got to find some way to increase the pupil-teacher ratio. Now, whether that means you eliminate some of the small classes and thereby cut your curriculum, which is not very satisfactory and I don't think really very acceptable to the community at large. I think the community feels that by and large we should have a school system that compares with others in the state in the way of curriculum offerings, but I think we have to consider this certainly; and the other way to affect the pupil-teacher ratio is somehow to figure out a way for a teacher to handle more students at once, whether it's by closed circuit TV or computer or some technological advancement. I have been sort of harping on this for a year, and I haven't gotten any place; and it just isn't because the administration isn't willing to do it, but because there just doesn't seem to be any way yet for it to get done, and I sure hope that something can be done soon.

Q Why is it impossible for a teacher to handle more than 19 or 14 or 23 students?

A I shouldn't say it is impossible, Larry, because it is possible. The teachers say that -- let's say a Junior High Social Studies class, for example, they say that 23 is a good size, 25 is not bad, but when it gets up near 30 or 31, if it is a class where you are trying to get some discussion, they say it is just too hard to get that many people involved in it. I have to assume that their decision is based on a professional approach and not their desire just to have a smaller number of kids. I really wouldn't want to say that, well, this is a teacher saying they can't handle more than 25 is because they just don't want that many more kids. I don't think our teachers in our system by and large would say that. I think they honestly feel that they can't get some of

these concepts across to the kinds when it gets 30 or more. But, nevertheless, I think this is an area where we have to continually work on it to see if there isn't some way they can do it. And in foreign language, for example, with the development of foreign language labs, I would think they could certainly. This is a technological advance, I would think, that permits this.

Q Well, your estimates, you say, would show that approximately 125 teachers would have to be eliminated from the system should Commissioner Ryan's approach be instituted. I may bring -- is that a correct figure?

A I think so, at least when I look at it that way, I have to come to that conclusion.

Q Well, I may bring the teachers down on my neck, but is there any reason why the administration would be reluctant to let that number of teachers go should the necessity arise?

A No, I don't think so. I think that if we could show that we could do a satisfactory job educating children with that many less teachers, sure I think we would be remiss in not doing it. I think the community would criticize us for not doing it.

Q I believe I heard you mention that you had it figured that the average teacher's wage was \$8,500.

A I think it is about that. That is correct.

Q This is for a nine month --

A Nine and a half months.

Q Nine and a half months of the year job?

A Yes.

Q We received some figures from some people in town today which indicates that the average wage of the worker in Janesville ranges about \$6,700 a year for a twelve-month working year. Then actually wouldn't you say it would be fair to say that the teachers are earning an above-average wage?

A Yes, if you say above-average wage, I think this is correct. Now you must remember these averages that produce this \$8,500 include people with master's degrees, with ten to fifteen years of experience.

Q Well, I think you also have to remember, if I may interrupt for a moment, that the \$6,700 figure includes salaries of professional people in town, too?

A Are you sure?

Q Yes.

A Well, I'd have to ask you what kind of professional people and with what years of experience and what makes up your total on which you are averaging. For example, if you take the average salary of a college graduate in Janesville, I am sure it would be more than \$6,700.

Q I think we are speaking of an overall average, Bob.

A I don't think it would be fitting to compare the average teacher's salary with the average wage earner's salary because I would say to you that I think a teacher should make more than the fellows working down the line at Chevrolet because of the kind of preparation he has to make. I am not saying the fellow on the line isn't making a contribution to society; but I think just in comparing salaries, I think you should compare the average teacher's salary with the average salary of professions, like college graduates in Jamesville. We have tried to do this in the past. Four or five years ago I think it was done. My own scattered investigation would indicate that the average salary for college graduates is at least, well on a year-round basis, certainly would be more than \$8,500. On a year-round basis \$8,500 is something like a little over \$10,000, I think, on a year-round basis. I don't know whether the average professional in Jamesville is making this or not.

Q Well, just to go back for a moment. I don't think there would be anyone that would disagree that the teacher should make more than the average man on the assembly line, but I think the point I was trying to bring up is the fact that the average teacher is now doing so.

A Yes, yes, definitely.

Q If I can proceed here a little bit further, may I ask you, in light of the total budget for the City of Jamesville that has been presented, in light of the fact that a good percentage of that budget does relate to school costs, how much do you feel the people of Jamesville can afford?

A I don't know how to answer this Larry. If you ask me how expensive a car can I afford individually, it depends on what I would use the car for, I suppose. If it is a business necessity and if I can show that I need it to impress customers, or whatever you might have, why I can get up to a pretty fancy car. But if I just need it to get back and forth to work, then it is a wholly different matter. I think it is a matter of how we are going to place education with respect to other government services and what kind of support we are going to give to it. Again, we don't like to be led around by the nose by other cities, but our per pupil cost, as you know from your attendance at Board meetings, is substantially lower than most other cities; and they're paying for their educational system, and I think we should too. My own scale of values would place education fairly high. These substantial increases are not what we like to present. We just dearly love to say, okay, we are not going to need any more next year than we needed last year. We would be big heroes. But our obligation is to present what we think the need of the system is to maintain somewhat the same quality. So this -- I don't know how to answer your question on how much we can afford. I think the property taxes are a bad base on which to get our funds because property itself is not increasing anywhere near like costs are. Property as a symbol of wealth is no longer what it was, so therefore I think we are going to have to get into some other means of supporting the school system.

Q Don't get me wrong; I am not trying to intimidate you or anything; but don't you feel, though, that a Board of Education member, when he is considering a budget of this size, does have to take into consideration how much the people can afford?

A I think this is true, Larry. We have to at least take into consideration the size, the percentage of the increase. Perhaps this is something that we can get a handle on a little better than the vague idea of how much people can afford because some people can afford it and some people can't very well. Because the people on fixed income, whose property tax is going up by five

or ten or fifteen per cent and have no way of getting additional income to cover the cost, this is very hurtful; and I guess you would have to say they probably can't afford it. Whereas others of us who have children in school, I think it would be tougher to say we can't afford it. We don't like to spend the additional money, but no taxpayer is paying for the cost of his children's school. You know, say a home is assessed for \$10,000 -- paying say, \$600 in taxes, \$650 -- if he has three children, he is only paying for the cost of one of them, and the other two are being born by taxpayers as a whole so that when his children are through the system then his continued payment of property taxes could be looked upon as a paying back to the community for what was provided for his children. And I think we would have to say that some people on fixed income are doing that now if they had children. We are concerned about the percentage of increase that is in this budget, yes, we are. We don't like it. We've got to make a decision one way or the other.

Q. Let me put it a little more specifically. As I look at this budget, let me ask you, then, do you think that the taxpayers of Janesville can afford this budget?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Okay, fine, great. Go ahead.

Q. Very directly, and this will be my last question. Perhaps just a little different twist to that question. Do you feel, as a member of the Board of Education, that this budget as presented can be justified in every respect as being the minimum necessary to support what you feel is a standard of education that should be maintained in the city without any extra unnecessary?

A. I would answer that yes, and just qualify it a little bit because this is in the area of where it's a matter of each member deciding what he feels the community needs and should be willing to pay for, and my own personal opinion is that this budget is one that is needed by this community and it should be willing to pay for it.

Q. I do have one more question that occurred to me that we didn't even touch on during the whole discussion. I hate to keep you here so long, Bob, but do you feel that the driver education program is one which the property taxpayer of Janesville should have to pay for?

A. This is a good question, Larry. I think that the -- going into this whole driver education program, I think I would have to say -- the investigation of it I would have to say -- that I was reluctant to go ahead with driver education. I felt that this was something that wasn't an academic subject, and we should try to move it out of our schools if possible. With the information I have gathered, I am convinced that the public schools do provide the best institution to teach traffic safety and proper attitude toward traffic safety. I think that the public school should try to do what they can to meet this horrendous problem of this slaughter on our highways. Consequently, I am in favor of offering a driver education program in the public schools. I think the indication is -- although the proof certainly isn't conclusive -- the indication is that it does help reduce traffic accidents. I do think that the state should do something to permit the local schools to charge the individual student more than they can charge now to cover the cost of behind-the-wheel instruction. We are only permitted to charge \$5.00 now, and I am sure that our per pupil cost of behind-the-wheel instruction is greater than that; and I think we should be permitted to charge more, so the property taxpayer would not have as much of a burden; so that the property taxpayer, for example, would end up paying for the cost of the classroom instruction but not the behind-the-wheel instruction.

Q This full discussion has lead me down to one final question, Bob. The problem seems to be the property tax where you are getting the major portion of your funds for school purposes and, once again, it seems to be the problem of not being able to -- for driver's education -- to charge more money to the pupil. Can I ask you: is our Board of Education doing anything in the way of attempting to get the State to change, number one, the source of funds for the Board of Education to take the burden off the property taxpayer, and number two, to get the State to increase the amount of money they are -- the Board of Education can charge for driver's education?

A I would have to answer yes to both questions. The effort that we are making to get a different source of financing is through the School Board Association. They are pushing for a sales tax by the state, an increase in the sales tax. I don't recall specifically whether the suggestion is to increase the rate or extend the number of things that it is applied to. I suspect the latter. To provide the State with more funds so that they can in turn return funds to the school districts. And I have been in touch specifically with the State Department of Public Instruction on the value and validity, I should say, of being able to charge more for driver education. This whole question of state aid to municipalities, I think, is somewhat confusing because the state, and the Governor particularly, point out that Wisconsin is very high in the amount of funds that are returned to local municipalities. But, if you look at the city budget, the city summary I should say, of non-property tax revenues, you will find that the city gets something like 75 per cent of their money to run the city from the state. They only need to get 25 per cent from the property tax, and ours is just about the reverse. So most of the money that comes back from the state stays with the city, doesn't go to the school district, you see. And this is, I think, this is confusing and misleading because the property taxpayers primarily are the supporters of the local schools. It is not the state. But the state says we support local municipalities, and that's true if you consider the city and the school districts together, for example; and I think maybe the Tarr task force is going to try to do something about this. They are discussing it anyway.